



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Goethes Werke. Herausgegeben im Auftrage der Grossherzogin SOPHIE von Sachsen. I Abtheilung, 1 Band, Gedichte; 14 Band, Faust.—III Abtheilung, 1 Band, Tagebücher, 1775–87.—IV Abtheilung, 1 Band, Briefe, 1764–71. Frankfurt, Leipzig, Strassburg. 2 Band, Briefe, 1771–75. Frankfurt, Wetzlar, Schweiz. Weimar, Hermann Böhlau, 1887.

By the same publisher: Goethes Faust in ursprünglicher Gestalt nach der Göchhausenschen Abschrift herausgegeben von ERICH SCHMIDT. Weimar, 1887.

With the four volumes first mentioned the Goethe Society in Weimar begins the publication of the definitive edition of Goethe's works. The main principles which have guided the preparation of this edition have been to "reproduce in completeness and purity the entire product of Goethe's literary activity, together with everything that he has left which serves to illustrate his personality." The plan does not contemplate the publication of official documents, where form and character were determined by their direct purpose, nor the abundant extracts which served as material for the *Annalen*. The second guiding principle has been to adhere firmly to what is known to have been Goethe's will in regard to the form in which the separate works will be issued. This requires that the text shall follow, barring minor errors, the edition which received Goethe's last revision. This guarantees the preservation of the text, in the main, in the form in which we now possess it. The last years of the poet's life were devoted to a careful revision of his works and the preparation of a standard edition. Poems which the author, for reasons which he indicated, refused to publish, will not be published in violation of his express judgment. A canon of this kind will remove all expectation of novelties in works with which the public is familiar. The order of the contents of the separate volumes will follow that which Goethe established. Hitherto unpublished manuscripts will follow those already issued.

This edition is divided into four parts: 1. Goethe's literary works; 2. Scientific writings; 3. Journals; 4. Letters. The number of volumes under the first rubric is estimated at fifty, under the second at ten, while the Journals and Letters will probably comprise as many volumes more. The publication of the scientific writings as a separate part corresponds to Goethe's own design that they should form a supplement to his works. The question of the orthography has been a difficult one to settle, as the canons of spelling of the time were not fixed and Goethe's own usage was not consistent. Those who superintended the publication of Goethe's works introduced often that which was arbitrary and fanciful. Not only the forms of words, but words themselves, were often changed. In this edition irregularities and accidental differences will be corrected, while everything affecting the sound or pronunciation will be retained. In the Letters and Journals, however, which have so suffered in publication that it has required five editions of the correspondence with Schiller before we have attained an approximately faithful transcript, and where every turn and form reveals the personality of the author, we shall have a genuine reproduction of the original manuscripts. The journal which Goethe kept until within a few days of his death will furnish material of inestimable value for a correct understanding of the poet's life, and will be an important

contribution to contemporary literary history. Every volume will contain at the end the readings of the different editions published during Goethe's life, as well as manuscript readings, plans and sketches which show the original form of the poet's thought. Frequently the original sources of many passages have been discovered in the vast material in the Goethe Archives, and are cited in the material for text criticism. It is not designed to give notes or interpretations save as they exist in the material associated with a particular work. The collation of the different texts is assigned to numerous Goethe scholars under the direction of a central committee.

Volume I, the Poems, edited by G. von Loeper, contains an introduction by Herman Grimm, and a statement of the general plan of the work by B. Suphan, director of the Goethe Archives. Volume 16, *Faust*, is edited by Erich Schmidt, the Letters by von Biedermann, and the Journals by C. A. H. Burkhardt. While all these volumes present something new in text criticism, the additional material is most noticeable in the Journals, and especially in the first part of the Journal in Italy, and in the *Faust*. In the appendix to *Faust* such parts of the original copy of *Fräulein von Göchhausen*, recently discovered in Dresden, as differ from the *Faust* "Fragment" of 1790, or present additional material, are incorporated. The additional paralipomena to *Faust*, which are numerous, will contribute to a knowledge of the history of the growth of the drama.

Erich Schmidt has published a faithful reprint of the manuscript of *Faust*, which he was fortunate enough to discover among the papers of the *Fräulein von Göchhausen*, court lady of the Duchess Amalia, with an interesting introduction, and an appendix containing the various references in Goethe's *Tagebücher* to *Faust*, and thus forming a sort of chronological index of the time in which he was engaged upon it. It may be questioned whether the discovery of this new text will contribute anything to the appreciation of *Faust* as a work of art, or to the world's estimate of the merit of this wonderful poem. It will be a contribution to our knowledge of the history of the poem, and will guide to the interpretation and original form of some passages. Its relation to the author's life and intellectual growth will form a large part of its value. A knowledge of the particular day on which any passage was written may serve to illustrate the studies and the influences out of which the poem grew. The music of the verse, the charm of the lyric passages must always be felt directly and is not dependent upon this knowledge.

There is no date affixed to the manuscript to determine when the copy was made. That it is the earliest form of the *Faust* Fragment of 1790 can be demonstrated. It is substantially, in content, the old and yellow "codex" which Goethe carried to Italy. It was found in a thick quarto labeled "Extracts, copies, etc., from the remains of the *Frl. L. von G.*," which contains numerous memorials of the Weimar circle, occasional poems, and merry farces, and among them several of Goethe's minor works of his early days in Weimar. In that portion of the volume which contained *Faust* there were blank leaves, indicating gaps in the narrative, scenes remained to be filled out, or were only sketched.

Professor E. Schmidt concludes that the original manuscript of *Faust*, which was carried to Italy, was preserved until 1816, and that it was used in the

preparation of the Faust of 1816, and of the complete edition of Goethe's works of 1817, as a return to older readings which are preserved in the Göchhausen manuscript seems to prove, and that it finally disappeared before 1822, as it is not mentioned in Kräuber's Repetitorium of that date. The manuscript contains twenty-one scenes, of which the scenes in Auerbach's Keller and the Kerker scene are in prose. The Gretchen scenes do not differ greatly from the form with which we are familiar. The scene between Mephistopheles and the Scholar is much extended. Mephistopheles inquires first about his lodgings, and satirizes rather coarsely students' quarters and "Frau Spatterbier." Mephistopheles appears unheralded; there is no motive for his presence and no previous compact with Faust. The scene in Auerbach's Keller follows immediately. Faust appears here, instead of Mephistopheles, in the character in which he is represented in the puppet plays, as the magician and sleight-of-hand performer. There are numerous local references in this prose version. The fragment given in the paralipomena to Faust, entitled Landstrasse, where Mephistopheles casts down his eyes and hurries past a cross by the wayside, follows, a hint of the later revelation of his character. The scene in the Dom bears the title "Exequien der Mutter Gretgens," showing that Gretchen was attending the funeral office of her mother, a point which has not been generally accepted. Valentine's monologue at the opening of the Valentine scene is given, with the two following conversations, and is succeeded by "Was ist die Himmels Freud in ihren Armen," the present close of the scene Wald und Höhle. The Kerker scene does not contain the voice from above, "She is saved," as in the present version. The manuscript is written with the greatest care, and was evidently carefully revised, as is shown by minute marks and corrections to make it correspond with the original. It shows archaic forms and Frankfurt idioms and spellings. Goethe carefully pruned this early work and removed many forms which injured the harmony of the verse. There is a freshness and charm in the unstudied measures of the original which are not manifest in the finished work which we now possess. There are some lines in the opening monologue which are not only more graphic but metrically finer than the later version. The *burschikoses* element is more prominent in some of the scenes written when Goethe was fresh from the university. The recovery of this manuscript does not settle all questions connected with Faust chronology; it suggests many new questions and, in connection with the paralipomena, throws light on many passages. It furnishes a strong probability that the whole of the manuscript was written in Frankfurt. Indeed, the Frankfurt origin of the larger part can be demonstrated from contemporary records and internal evidence. There is also a presumption that Goethe did not occupy himself with Faust in the ten years of his official life, from 1776-86, from the absence of any mention in his journals and letters of such occupation. This is, of course, negative evidence, but in the case of a man like Goethe, whose literary work was the subject of constant conversation, it possesses great weight. Goethe, we know, took delight in his poem, and read it both in the Frankfurt and Weimar days to his friends, and it is praised in numerous letters of the time. It would be strange if Faust, under these circumstances, was entirely neglected in Weimar. The existence of certain portions which were not communicated to Fräulein von Göchhausen on account of their incom-

plete character is possible. It has been held by nearly all recent commentators that the scene "Vor dem Thor," with its description of Frankfurt views and mention of Frankfurt resorts, was written before going to Weimar. If not, it shows how fallacious is too great confidence in inferences of this character. The question arises, how does the discovery of this manuscript bear on current Faust criticism? Does it confirm or overthrow accepted views? Professor Scherer has been most prominent in investigating the original Faust. He brought the whole armory of criticism of the Lachmann school to bear upon the analysis and determining the date of the earliest Faust. Starting from the two prose scenes in Faust as we now possess it, he sought to show that other scenes had likewise been written in prose, and, when skilfully examined, revealed different dates of production, additions, interpolations, new motives and varying metres. Although Goethe had said in a letter to Schiller of May 5, 1798, "Some tragic scenes were written in prose, but since by their naturalness and strength in proportion to others they are intolerable, I am trying on this account to put them in rhyme, as there the thought shines through a veil and the direct effect of the tremendous material is softened," Scherer endeavored to prove that other scenes, not properly defined as tragic, had also a prose origin. He regarded the opening monologue to the appearance of the Erdgeist, the garden scene in which Mephistopheles and Faust and later Mephistopheles and Martha appear, also Martha's garden, in which Gretchen questions Faust about his religion, as showing a prose original. The Dom scene, in addition to "Trüber Tag, Feld," "Nacht. Offen Feld," is also "pure prose." "The evening spirits are an attempt of Goethe at sixty years to speak the jargon of his youth." The structure of this criticism is very elaborate. The scenes of the "Fragment" are subjected to a dislocation based entirely on subjective reasons. There is little account taken of poetic moods, of broken threads resumed after long intervals, of poetic fancies which resist a philosophical connection. Much of this criticism is penetrating and suggestive. The main points which Professor Scherer sought to establish are disproved by the manuscript, and the same critical procedure fails to detect the prose scenes of Auerbach's Keller and the Kerker. If this method of criticism is correct and the results trustworthy, they are valid against the evidence of the manuscript. If the criticism, however, breaks down in the presence of a modern poem, it shows with what caution its results should be received when applied to classical and mediaeval works.

W. T. H.

Sprachgebrauch und Sprachrichtigkeit im Deutschen, von K. G. ANDRESEN.
5 Auflage. Heilbronn, Gebr. Henninger. 1887.

In discussing the many discrepancies between common usage and correctness in the use of the German language, Professor Andresen only at times takes the somewhat pedantic standpoint characterized in so masterly a manner by Jacob Grimm (Kl. Schriften, I 272). In most cases he not only states the facts, but also gives the origin of irregular usages as they are based upon dialectic or foreign influences. The criterion for decision in doubtful cases is, according to Andresen, not the usage of classic writers, but the laws of the language which the grammarian has abstracted by careful investigation (cf. p. 6). While